

REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 29, 2008 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1, 7-8, 12, 14-15, 19-24, 28, and 30 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claim 5 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 18 was previously cancelled. No new matter has been added and no new issues are raised which require further consideration or search. Therefore, claims 1-4, 6-17, and 19-39 are currently pending in the application and are respectfully submitted for consideration.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended in conducting a telephone interview on December 10, 2008. In the telephone interview, proposed amendments to the present claims were discussed. The above amendments to the claims, are similar to the amendments discussed during the interview.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-17 and 19-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Chaney et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0108002) (“Chaney”). Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 has been cancelled, and that said cancellation effectively moots the rejection, with respect to claim 5. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully submit that said claims recite allowable subject matter for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-4 and 6-11 are dependent, recites a method, which includes receiving a service request according to a session initiation protocol, initiated by a first user and terminated at a second user, in a device serving the second user, and forwarding the received service request from the device to an application server to process the service request. The method further includes receiving, in the device, a processing result of the processed service request from the application server, and first determining in the device, based on the received processing result, whether a service request processing of the service request in the device is to be stopped. The service request and the processing result each include destination identifiers. The first determining further includes comparing the destination identifiers of the service request forwarded to the application server and the processing result received from the application server, and stopping the service request processing for the second user when the compared destinations identifiers are different.

Claim 12, of which claims 13-17 are dependent, recites a method, which includes receiving a service request according to a session initiation protocol, initiated by a first user and terminated at a second user, in an application server from a device serving the second user, and processing the service request in the application server. The method further includes returning a processing result of the processed service request to the device, based on the processing result the device being configured to determine whether a service request processing of the service request in the device is to be stopped. The service request and the processing result each include destination identifiers, and the

device is further configured to compare the destination identifiers of the service request and the processing result. The device is further configured to stop the service request processing for the second user when the compared destinations identifiers are different.

Claim 19 recites an apparatus, which includes means for receiving a service request according to a session initiation protocol initiated by a first user, and terminated at a second user, the apparatus serving the second user, and means for forwarding the received service request to an application server for processing the service request. The apparatus further includes means for receiving a processing result of the processed service request from the application server, and means for determining, based on the received processing result, whether a service request processing of the service request in the apparatus is to be stopped. The service request and the processing result each include destination identifiers. The means for determining further includes means for comparing the destination identifiers of the service request forwarded to the application server and the processing result received from the application server, and means for stopping the service request processing for the second user when the compared destinations identifiers are different.

Claim 20 recites an apparatus, which includes means for receiving a service request according to a session initiation protocol, initiated by a first user and terminated at a second user, from a device serving the second user, and means for processing the service request. The apparatus further includes means for returning a processing result of the processed service request to the device, based on the processing result the device

being configured to determine whether a service request processing of the service request in the device is to be stopped. The service request and the processing result each include destination identifiers, and the device is further configured to compare the destination identifiers of the service request and the processing result. The device is further configured to stop the service request processing for the second user when the compared destination identifiers are different.

Claim 21 recites a computer program product for use in an IP multimedia core network, the computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code embodied in the medium. The computer readable program code includes a first computer readable program code configured to cause a computer to receive a service request according to a session initiation protocol, initiated by a first user and terminated at a second user in a device serving the second user, and a second computer readable program code configured to cause the computer to forward the received service request from the device to an application server to process the service request. The computer readable program code further includes a third computer readable program code configured to cause the computer to receive a processing result of the processed service request from the application server in the device, and a fourth computer readable program code configured to cause the computer to determine in the device, based on the received processing result, whether a service request processing of the service request in the device is to be stopped. The service request and the processing result each include destination identifiers, and the fourth computer readable program code

is further configured to cause the computer to compare the destination identifiers of the service request forwarded to the application server and the processing result received from the application server. The fourth computer readable program code is further configured to stop the service request processing for the second user when the compared destination identifiers are different.

Claim 22 recites a computer program product for use in an IP multimedia core network, the computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code embodied in said medium. The computer readable program code includes a first computer readable program code configured to cause a computer to receive a service request according to a session initiation protocol initiated by a first user and terminated at a second user, from a device serving the second user, and a second computer readable program code configured to cause the computer to process the service request. The computer readable program code further includes a third computer readable program code configured to cause the computer to return a processing result of the processed service request to the device, based on the processing result the device being configured to determine whether a service request processing of the service request in the device is to be stopped. The service request and processing result each include destination identifiers, and the device is further configured to compare the destination of the service request and the processing result. The device is further configured to stop the service request processing for the second user when the compared destination identifiers are different.

Claim 23, upon which claims 25-34 are dependent, recites an apparatus, which includes a first receiver configured to receive a service request according to a session initiation protocol, initiated by a first user and terminated at a second user, the apparatus serving the second user, and a forwarder configured to forward the received service request to an application server configured to process the service request. The apparatus further includes a second receiver configured to receive a processing result of the processed service request from the application server, and a determiner configured to determine, based on the received processing result, whether a service request processing of the service request in the apparatus is to be stopped. The service request and the processing result each include the destination identifiers, and the determiner is further configured to compare the destination identifiers of the service request forwarded to the application server and the processing result received from the application server. The determiner is further configured to stop the service request processing for the second user when the compared destinations identifiers are different.

Claim 24, upon which claims 35-39 are dependent, recites an apparatus, which includes a receiver configured to receive a service request according to a session initiation protocol, initiated by a first user and terminated at a second user, from a device serving the second user, and a processor configured to process the service request. The apparatus further includes a returner configured to return a processing result of the processed service request to the device, based on the processing result the device being configured to determine whether a service request processing of the service request in the

apparatus is to be stopped. The service request and the processing result each include destination identifiers, and the device is further configured to compare the destination identifiers of the service request and the processing result. The device is further configured to stop the service request processing for the second user when the compared destinations identifiers are different.

As will be discussed below, Chaney fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claims, and therefore fails to provide the features discussed above.

Chaney generally discloses a system and method in a telecommunications network for billing a call placed by a user based on reported traffic load in the network. The system includes at least one Media Gateway Control Function (MGCF) that sends a reported traffic load for the MGCF in a registration message to a presence and instant messaging (PIM) Server. Users that subscribe to a load-based billing service also register with the PIM Server. The PIM Server sends the reported traffic load to the users whenever the traffic load is updated by the MGCF, and to a billing node when the user places the call. A Call State Control Function (CSCF) sends the duration of the call to the billing node. The billing node determines a billing rate based on the reported traffic load and calculates a charge for the call based on the determined billing rate and the duration of the call. (See Chaney at Abstract).

Applicants respectfully submit that Chaney fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, all of the elements of the present claims. For example, Chaney fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, at least, “*wherein the service request and the processing result each include*

destination identifiers,” and “the first determining comprising comparing the destination identifiers of the service request forwarded to the application server and the processing result received from the application server and stopping the service request processing for the second user when the compared destinations identifiers are different,” as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 12 and 19-24.

Chaney discloses a PIM Server modified to recognize Media Gateway Control Functions (MGCFS) as service providers, and to calculate a network traffic load from the traffic loads reported by the MGCFS. The PIM Server retains information describing the MGCFS capabilities and current traffic load. When a session is requested by a user, the PIM server forwards the request to a server with the correct capabilities. (See Chaney at col. 7, lines 36-67). However, Chaney fails to disclose, or suggest, comparing the destination identifiers of the service request forwarded to the application server and the processing result received from the application server and stopping the service request processing for the second user when the compared destinations identifiers are different.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Chaney fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, all of the elements of independent claims 1, 12, and 19-24. For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 and 6-11 depend upon independent claim 1. Claims 13-17 depend upon independent claims 12. Claims 25-34 depend upon independent claim 23. Claims 35-39 depend upon independent claim 24. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-4, 6-11, 13-17, 25-34, and 35-39 should be allowed for at least their dependence

claims 2-4, 6-11, 13-17, 25-34, and 35-39 should be allowed for at least their dependence upon independent claims 1, 12, 23, and 24, respectively, and for the specific elements recited therein.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. These distinctions are more than sufficient to render the claimed invention unanticipated and unobvious. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 1-4, 6-17, and 19-39 be allowed, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Mullervy
Registration No. 62,382

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Vienna, Virginia 22182-6212
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

KMM:sew